REMARKS

Claims 7-12 and 27-31 are all the claims pending in the application. The Examiner

withdraws the rejection of claims 7-12 and 27-31 as allegedly being unpatentable over the Brown

publication and Benedikt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,966,535 (*see* Office Action: pages 2 and 5).

However, the Examiner newly rejects claims 7-12 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly being unpatentable over Levine et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,405,221 (hereinafter

"Levine").

Applicants traverse this new grounds of rejection for at least the following exemplary

reasons.

Claim 7 is directed to a method "for managing internet presentation materials in a single

file format for ease of administration while presenting to a requestor only those portions of the

file requested". Disparately, Levine relates to a method for creating the appearance of multiple

embedded pages of information or data in a network or Web display under control of a

"browser" program (Levine: col. 1, lines 8-15), by using data from multiple files. Levine does

not teach or suggest using a single file format as required by claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is not

rendered obvious by a reasonable modification, if any, of Levine. For example and not by way

of limitation:

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, "defining, in a first portion of the file, a first variable equal to

first information and a second variable equal to second information". The Examiner alleges that

Levine discloses these recited features by describing the defining of parameters for categories

2

(*e.g.*, Page Length, Graphics, etc.) displayed on a composite page (*citing* Levine: col. 8, lines 25-61; and Figs. 4-5). To the contrary, in Levine, topical sections such as Page Length, Guidelines, etc. are defined in a first area and thus correspond to static or fixed data (Levine: col. 4, lines 49-50; col. 5, lines 20-23; Figs. 4-5, area 42; and claim 1) to be used in forming composite pages.

Furthermore, Levine extracts a brief "rule" summary or abstract (*e.g.*, a topic sentence, a meaningful title, etc.) from each of the initialized files in the source files corresponding to the aforementioned topics, to facilitate the user/viewer's navigation through the composite pages (Levine: col. 7, lines 48-57; and Fig. 11). Thus, contrary to "managing internet presentation materials in a single file format", as recited in claim 7, Levine discloses that the variable data to be displayed in a second area 44 of the composite pages is defined in multiple files. Indeed, Levine discloses saving the subsections of data relating to each topic (*e.g.*, Page Length, Graphics, etc.) in separate files or documents (Levine: col. 7, lines 7-11). For example, the files/subsections of data "A" designated as Doc.1 may relate to the topic "Page Length" while the files/subsections of data "B" designated as Doc.2 may relate to the topic "Graphics", etc. (Levine: col. 7, lines 11-18; and Figs. 7-9 and 11). Levine neither teaches nor suggests saving data relating to each topic in a single file. Levine even goes on to disclose that certain files in one Doc.# may be duplicates of files in another topical heading list of files, or there may exist cross linkages or even further sub-section linkages to other files (Levine: col. 7, lines 15-18).

Furthermore, claim 7 recites "defining, in a second portion of the file, first and second presentation layouts, wherein said first presentation layout includes said first variable and said second presentation layout includes said second variable". The Examiner alleges that Levine

3

discloses these recited features by describing the creation of a window on the display screen

having the capability of receiving a variable but requested grouping of data therein (*citing*

Levine: col. 9, lines 13-22). To the contrary, Levine describes creating a template of static user

data defining a predetermined area on a display screen (Levine: col. 2, lines 32-37; Abstract; and

Figs. 4-5). The template includes a second static area defining a variable data receiving window

on the screen and which is capable of receiving requested groupings of data therein (Levine: col.

2, lines 37-40; Abstract; and Figs. 4-5). Thus, any presentation layout in Levine requires both

the template and variable data corresponding to the requested groupings of data (Levine: Figs. 7-

9 and 11). These groupings of data correspond to subsections of data relating to each topic and

are stored as separate files/documents (Levine: col. 7, lines 7-18; and Fig. 11). Furthermore,

Levine describes that the template itself is saved as a separate file (Levine: col. 7, lines 7-8).

Consequently, contrary to "managing internet presentation materials in a single file format", as

recited in claim 7, Levine discloses only multiple files to form a composite page for viewing on

the display screen (col. 2, lines 44-51; and Figs. 4-5). Levine neither teaches nor suggests using

a single file holding the variables and the information as required by claim 7.

Additionally, the Examiner alleges that a window having the capability to receive a

variable of requested data to be displayed thereon, which corresponds to one of the static

categories (topics), defines a presentation layout for the particular topic (Office Action: page 3).

The Examiner's allegation is irrelevant since, as noted above, the variable data for each topic is

stored in a separate file (*see* Levine: Fig. 11), *e.g.*, in database 70, as well as the template being

stored in a separate file (Levine: col. 7, lines 7-8).

Further still, claim 7 recites "generating a page of presentation material in response to a

request for said first information, wherein the page is generated based on the first presentation

layout and includes said first information and does not contain said second information". In this

manner, information is defined only once, in the variable definitions that are maintained in a

single file along with the presentation layouts, yet multiple web pages can be generated from this

single file. The Examiner alleges that Levine discloses these features by describing that upon

selecting a topic such as A, B or C, only the A, B or C information is respectively displayed

(*citing* Levine: col. 6, lines 35-47; and Fig. 7).

Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits that Levine fails to teach or suggest all the

features of claim 7. Instead, Levine discloses forming a composite page by a browser merging a

template and variable information from separate files (Levine: col. 2, lines 44-51; col. 6, lines

48-55; col. 8, lines 25-30; and Figs. 7-9). Indeed, as noted above, Levine describes that the topic

information (*e.g.*, A, B or C) and the template are not defined in the same single file (Levine: col.

7, lines 7-18).

For at least the above exemplary reasons, claim 7 is patentable over a reasonable

modification, if any, of Levine. Claims 11 and 27 recite similar features and are therefore

patentable over Levine based on a rationale analogous to that set forth above for claim 7.

Consequently, claims 8-10, 12 and 28-31 are patentable over a reasonable modification,

if any, of Levine, at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Billy Carter Raulerson
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 52,156
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 14, 2004